

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

### **I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS**

Claims 1-6, 9-15, and 18 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 10, which are independent, are amended in this paper. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification, specifically at page 49.

No new matter has been introduced. It is submitted that the claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are primarily cosmetic and are made simply for clarification.

### **II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claim 1-6, 9-15, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,956,025 to Goulden et al. (hereinafter, merely “Goulden”) and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,219,837 to Yeo et al. (hereinafter, merely “Yeo”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. U.S. 5,977,974 to Hatori et al. (hereinafter, merely “Hatori”) and U.S. Patent No. U.S. 6,253,218 to Aoki et al. (hereinafter, merely “Aoki”).

### III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

**“wherein the value of maximum number of images that are allowed to be arranged spirally is displayed with the plurality of images.”** (emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that Goulden, Yeo, Hatori, and Aoki, taken either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 1. Specifically, there is nothing that teaches or discloses “wherein the value of maximum number of images that are allowed to be arranged spirally is displayed with the plurality of images.” as recited in independent claim 1.

Indeed, claim 1 recites displaying a value of maximum number of spirally arranged images with the plurality of images. Goulden, Yeo, Hatori, and Aoki do not disclose or teach the above-identified features.

Therefore, independent claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to, or somewhat similar to, those described above with regard to independent claim 1, claim 10 is patentable.

### IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

Each of the other claims in this application is dependent on an independent claim discussed above, and is therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons presented for the independent claim upon which it depends. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited references it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Frommer Lawrence & Haug LLP  
Attorneys for Applicants

By:



Thomas F. Presson  
Reg. No. 41,442  
(212) 588-0800